



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/944,217	09/04/2001	Mathias Schafforz	31653-174372	2647
26694	7590	11/21/2003	EXAMINER	
VENABLE, BAETJER, HOWARD AND CIVILETTI, LLP P.O. BOX 34385 WASHINGTON, DC 20043-9998			CHOI, STEPHEN	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3724	8	
DATE MAILED: 11/21/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/944,217	SCHAFFORZ, MATHIAS
	Examiner Stephen Choi	Art Unit 3724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 September 2003.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-3,5-12 and 14-31 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5,6,16,17 and 23-28 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-3,7-12,14,15,18-22 and 29-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 17 September 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 18-19 are objected to because of the following informalities: "said first rolls" should be --said first pair of rolls--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 19, it is not clear what structure is set forth by "said first rolls are adjacent one side of said path and said advancing means further includes a second pair of rolls each engaging a different one of strips, the rolls of said second pair being adjacent the other side of said path". If the first rolls are adjacent to the one side of the path and the second rolls are adjacent to the other side of the path, the second pair of rolls can only engage the same one of the strips.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-3, 7-12, 14-15, 18-22, and 29-31, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Mattei et al. (US 4,627,319).

Mattei '319 discloses all the recited steps and elements of the invention including:

- a) means for advancing the web (3);
- b) means for subdividing the web including a severing unit (8, 9);
- c) means for monitoring the widths of each of the strips and for generating first signals denoting the monitored widths (33,34, Figures 4-5);
- d) means for processing the first signals and for generating second signals (Figures 4-5);
- e) adjusting means including means for shifting at least one of the web and the subdividing means (5);

Regarding claims 10-12, 14, 21-22, 29-31, means for changing the level (17, 18, see col. 5, line 52- col. 6, line 2). Regarding claims 18-19, a pair of rolls (15, 16).

In the alternative, if it is argued that Mattei does not disclose means for monitoring the widths of each of the strips and for generating first signals denoting the monitored width, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to employ an additional means for monitoring (33) of the width in lieu of element 34, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 17 September 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the rejections under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph on claim 19, see above. As stated previously, the second pair of rolls cannot each engage a different one of the strips as claimed since the second rolls are adjacent to one side of the path.

Applicant contends that claims as amended distinguish over Mattei since Mattei only teaches measuring the width of only one of the strips.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Although Mattei teaches checking the width of only one of two strips, detectors together with electric circuits function in such a way to effectively measure the widths of both strips since the circuits generate signals corresponding to the sensed width of the one of the two strips based on the predetermined desired dimension of the one of the two strips such that the sensed dimension of the one of the two strips denotes the width of the other strip also. Thus, the teachings of Mattei satisfies the limitations "monitoring the widths of each of the strips and generating signals denoting the monitored widths" set forth in claim 1 and "means for monitoring the widths of each of the strips and for generating first signals denoting the monitored widths" set forth in claim 15. It is noted that the claims do not require having two separate sensors to measure the widths of each of the strips. It

merely requires means for monitoring the widths of each of the strips and for generating signals indicating the monitored widths.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to S. Choi whose telephone number is 703-306-4523. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday between 9am and 5pm. If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Allan Shoap can be reached on 703-308-1082.

In lieu of mailing, it is encouraged that all formal responses be faxed to 703-872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1148.

sc
November 19, 2003


STEPHEN CHOI
PRIMARY EXAMINER